



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,561	03/25/2004	Kenichi Ide	6639P018	7935
8791 7590 06/25/2007 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER LEE, CHUN KUAN	
			ART UNIT 2181	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,561	IDE, KENICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee	2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Donald Spraks (SPE).

(3) Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee (Examiner).

(2) Alford Kindred (SPE).

(4) William Schaal (Attorney Reg. # 39,018).

Date of Interview: 14 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kimura et al. (US Patent 6,170,026) and Bastiani et al. (US Patent 6,442,628).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Please see Continuation Sheet below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

The interview mainly clarified the claimed limitation of "means for detecting" in the independent claim 1.

Applicant presented that the "means for detecting" is accomplished base on the received responses, wherein the responses comprise responsive (Drawings, Fig. 7) and non-responsive (Drawings, Fig. 6). The result from the detection based on the responses would be to establish a communication connection with a connection object, wherein the connection object is present during responsive and is not present during non-responsive (Drawings, Fig. 8).

No agreement was reached as a result from the interview.



DONALD SPARKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Interview Request

Dear Examiner Lee,

Pursuant to your request, we respectfully request an interview to discuss the "detecting" limitations of claims 1 and 16 in particular. We would like to organize the interview into a discussion of an embodiment of the invention outlined in the application (5 minutes), the teachings of the prior art references (5-10 minutes) and the allowability of the claims based on the lack of such teachings (10 minutes).

If acceptable, please advise if you would be able to conduct a telephonic interview on Thursday, June 14th. I am available from 3 PM EST and later that day.

Thank you.

Bill Schaal, BSTZ

Appn: 10/809,561